



COLORADO
Department of Education

Technical Advisory Panel Webinar

February 28, 2018

Reporting on Race/Ethnicity for the 2018 District and School Performance Frameworks



Overview of the Decision

- Under the current performance frameworks, all race/ethnicity groups other than “White” are reported under the heading of “Minority Students”
 - Ratings associated with the “Minority Students” subgroup determine a portion of the points earned on the Achievement, Growth, and PWR indicators.
- For the 2018 frameworks, it has been proposed that each race/ethnicity group be included separately
 - Using individual race/ethnicity groups for reporting and for ratings determinations would be consistent with Colorado’s plan for federal reporting under ESSA.
 - Under the ESSA plan, students who belong to race/ethnicity groups where schools do not meet the minimum n-count would be reported under a new category, tentatively labeled “Aggregated non-White Students” .

Impact of Including Individual Race/Ethnicity Categories

- Given the minimum n-count requirements, the shift to including individual race/ethnic groups on performance frameworks would have a significant impact on how non-White students are represented in the frameworks
- These impacts center around two major issues:
 - Minimum n-count requirements dictate that non-White students as a whole would see their representation reduced under a system where results for each race/ethnicity group are reported separately - this is true even with the introduction of a new category of “Aggregated non-White Students” .
 - The new “Aggregated non-White Students” category would, by definition, lack consistent meaning, so would pose challenges to interpreting results.

Reduced Representation of non-White Students

- A simple example illustrates how the proposed change to reporting on performance frameworks would result in reduced representation for non-White students:
 - Consider a school where there are achievement results for 20 Hispanic students.
 - In addition to the 20 scores for Hispanic students, the school has achievement results for 12 Black students and for three Native American students.
 - The school has no scores for students in any of the other non-White race/ethnicity groups.

Slide 5

PA3

Interesting (and just FYI) - I capitalized the 'B' in black to match the capital 'W' in white when referring to groups so we're consistent. Looks like there's no real consensus on this though: <http://www.diversitystyleguide.com/glossary/white-white/>

Piche, Ashley, 2/27/2018

Reduced Representation of non-White Students

- Continuing with this example:
 - For this school, the results for Hispanic students would meet the minimum n-count requirement of 16, so would be reported separately.
 - Neither the Black nor the Native American results would meet the minimum n-count requirements, so these would be grouped together as “Aggregated non-White Students” .
 - Because minimum n-count requirements would also be imposed on the “Aggregated non-White Students” category, the 15 scores for Black and Native American students would ultimately not be reported at all.

Reduced Representation of non-White Students

- Takeaways from this example:
 - Under existing reporting practice, the 15 scores for black and Native American students would be included in the “Minority Students” category along with the scores for Hispanic students, so that results for all 35 students would be represented.
 - With the proposed changes, only 20 of the 35 total scores for non-White students would be reported.
 - While the number of students impacted at individual schools might seem small, the following analysis shows that the cumulative impacts across the state would be quite large.
 - The impacts would not be evenly distributed, with smaller race/ethnicity groups seeing much larger proportional reductions than the state’s largest non-White group, Hispanics.

Analysis: Reduced Representation of non-White Students

- On the 2017 School Performance Frameworks, the English Language Arts achievement metrics reported under the “All Students” group represented 99.5% of all eligible results.*
- The results reported under the “Minority Students” subgroup on the 2017 frameworks represented 98.3% of eligible achievement outcomes for non-White students.
- The representation of non-White students within the “Minority Students” subgroup was on par with the representation that White students would have had if they had been reported as a distinct subgroup.

2017 English Language Arts Achievement, School-Level Results: Reporting on "Minority Students" Subgroup

Ethnicity	Total	# Reported	# Not Reported	% Reported
All Students	457,981	455,534	2,447	99.5%
Minority Students	215,804	212,051	3,753	98.3%
White Students	242,177	238,056	4,121	98.3%

* Note: For the School Performance Frameworks, eligible records are those where students had valid scores and met requirements around continuous enrollment, expelled status, and home-school status. The exclusion of 0.5% of eligible records reflects the imposition of minimum n-count requirements, which dictate that results are not reported in cases where there are fewer than 16 records available at a given grade level within a school.

Analysis: Reduced Representation of non-White Students

- Shifting to a system where individual race/ethnicity groups are included as separate subgroups would result in reduced representation for non-White students on the School Performance Frameworks
- This reduction in the representation of non-White students would occur even with the introduction of a new "Aggregated non-White Subgroup".

2017 English Language Arts Achievement, School-Level Results: Reporting on Race/Ethnicity Categories plus "Aggregated non-White Students" Subgroup				
Ethnicity	Total	# Reported	# Not Reported	% Reported
American Indian or Alaska Native	3,302	573	2,729	17.4%
Asian	14,698	8,586	6,112	58.4%
Black	20,423	15,286	5,137	74.8%
Hawaiian/Pacific Islander	1,075	-	1,075	0.0%
Hispanic	158,183	153,612	4,571	97.1%
Two or More Races	18,123	9,254	8,869	51.1%
Aggregated non-White Students	28,493	15,496	12,997	54.4%
Minority Student Totals	215,804	202,807	12,997	94.0%

Analysis: Reduced Representation of non-White Students

- Whereas 98.3% of English Language Arts achievement outcomes for non-white students were reported under the “Minority Students” subgroup on the 2017 frameworks, only 94.0% would have been included had the state adhered to the method that has been proposed for ESSA reporting.
- The number of non-White students whose results would be excluded from the frameworks would increase by 9,244: from 3,753 under the current system to 12,997 under the proposed new system.

2017 English Language Arts Achievement, School-Level Results: Reporting on Race/Ethnicity Categories plus "Aggregated non-White Students" Subgroup				
Ethnicity	Total	# Reported	# Not Reported	% Reported
American Indian or Alaska Native	3,302	573	2,729	17.4%
Asian	14,698	8,586	6,112	58.4%
Black	20,423	15,286	5,137	74.8%
Hawaiian/Pacific Islander	1,075	-	1,075	0.0%
Hispanic	158,183	153,612	4,571	97.1%
Two or More Races	18,123	9,254	8,869	51.1%
Aggregated non-White Students	28,493	15,496	12,997	54.4%
Minority Student Totals	215,804	202,807	12,997	94.0%

Analysis: Reduced Representation of non-White Students

- Except in the case of Hispanic students, which are the largest group of non-White students, creating an “Aggregated non-White Students” subgroup would not be an effective method for ensuring representation on par with the current system.
- Even with the creation of an “Aggregated non-White Students” subgroup, representation for all race/ethnicity groups other than Hispanic would fall below 90.0%.
 - Nearly half of the results for American Indian or Alaska Natives and for Hawaiian/Pacific Islanders would be excluded from the performance frameworks.
 - Just over 11.0% of results for Black students and 15.0% of results for Asian Students would be excluded.

2017 English Language Arts Achievement, School-Level Results:

Total Representation of non-White students using Race/Ethnicity Categories and "Aggregated non-White Students" Subgroup

Ethnicity	Total # of Students with Results	# Reported in Race/Ethnicity Subgroup	# Reported in Aggregated Non-White Subgroup	Total # Reported	% Reported
American Indian or Alaska Native	3,302	573	1,279	1,852	56.1%
Asian	14,698	8,586	3,896	12,482	84.9%
Black	20,423	15,286	2,827	18,113	88.7%
Hawaiian/Pacific Islander	1,075	-	581	581	54.0%
Hispanic	158,183	153,612	1,862	155,474	98.3%
Two or More Races	18,123	9,254	5,051	14,305	78.9%
Total	215,804	187,311	15,496	202,807	94.0%

Analysis: Reduced Representation of non-White Students

- In comparison, under the current method where non-White students are reported together under the “Minority Students” subgroup, no individual race/ethnicity category has fewer than 95.0% of results included in accountability determinations.
- While Hispanic students would have roughly equivalent representation under either system, all other race/ethnicity groups - particularly the smallest groups - would see their representation reduced significantly.

2017 English Language Arts Achievement, School-Level Results:

Representation of non-White students using Minority Students Subgroup vs. using Race/Ethnicity Categories and Aggregated non-White Students Subgroup

Ethnicity	Total	Reported in Minority Students Subgroup		Reported using Race/Ethnicity Categories and Aggregated Non-White Subgroup		Difference	
		#	%	#	%	#	%
American Indian or Alaska Native	3,302	3,149	95.4%	1,852	56.1%	-1,297	-39.3%
Asian	14,698	14,512	98.7%	12,482	84.9%	-2,030	-13.8%
Black	20,423	20,193	98.9%	18,113	88.7%	-2,080	-10.2%
Hawaiian/Pacific Islander	1,075	1,053	98.0%	581	54.0%	-472	-43.9%
Hispanic	158,183	155,503	98.3%	155,474	98.3%	-29	0.0%
Two or More Races	18,123	17,641	97.3%	14,305	78.9%	-3,336	-18.4%
Total	215,804	212,051	98.3%	202,807	94.0%	-9,244	-4.3%

Analysis: Reduced Representation of non-White Students in School-Level Reporting

- The slides presented to this point have been aimed at illustrating the cumulative impact of the proposed changes on the representation of non-white students across the state.
- It is also important to understand how these changes impact the information that is available to evaluate the performance of individual schools.
- The next series of slides looks at the proportion of schools with Achievement results for non-white students that would meet the requirements for having these results included in the performance frameworks.
- Following the structure of the performance frameworks, elementary school, middle school, and high school results are presented separately.

Analysis: Reduced Representation of non-White Students in School-Level Reporting

- For the 2017 performance frameworks, there were 1,086 schools with elementary school level Achievement results.
 - 96% of schools saw these results reported under the “All Students” category.
- 1,070 schools had elementary school level results for non-White Students.
 - 89% of schools saw results for non-White students reported under the “Minority Students” category.
- For comparison, there were 1,079 schools with elementary school level results specifically for White Students.
 - If “White Students” had been a separate reporting category, 87% of schools would have met the n-count requirements to have these results reported.

**2017 CMAS English Language Arts Achievement, Elementary Results:
Reporting on "Minority Students" Subgroup**

Ethnicity	School with Results	Schools Reporting	Schools Not Reporting	% Reporting
All Students	1,086	1,043	43	96%
Minority Students	1,070	948	122	89%
White Students	1,079	934	145	87%

Analysis: Reduced Representation of non-White Students in School-Level Reporting

- With the proposed changes, very few elementary schools would have enough results for individual race/ethnicity groups to be included in the performance frameworks.
 - The exception is Hispanic students, where 90.0% of elementary schools would have results included, either as a standalone category or as part of the “Aggregated non-White Students” group.
 - In contrast, the proportion of schools reporting on non-White students other than Hispanics would be in the range of 41% to 54%, with the majority of these included in the “Aggregated non-White Students” group rather than being reported as distinct race/ethnicity groups.
 - Under the proposed reporting scheme, only 35% of elementary schools would see all of their results for non-White students represented in the frameworks, in contrast to 88.6% when using the “Minority Students” category.

**2017 CMAS English Language Arts Achievement, Elementary Results:
Reporting using Race/Ethnicity Categories and Aggregated non-White Students Subgroup**

Ethnicity	Schools with Results	Reporting using Race/Ethnicity Categories		Reporting using Aggregated Non-White Subgroup		Reporting using Race/Ethnicity Categories and Aggregated Non-White Subgroup	
		#	%	#	%	#	%
American Indian or Alaska Native	567	5	1%	229	40%	234	41%
Asian	781	98	13%	308	39%	406	52%
Black	799	159	20%	271	34%	430	54%
Hawaiian/Pacific Islander	252	-	0%	128	51%	128	51%
Hispanic	1,058	880	83%	68	6%	948	90%
Two or More Races	964	148	15%	318	33%	466	48%
All Non-White Students*	1,070	12	1%	359	34%	371	35%

* Note: This record is intended to show the proportion of schools where results for all non-white students within a given school would be represented. It is not a simple sum of the preceding categories.

Analysis: Reduced Representation of non-White Students in School-Level Reporting

- Looking at the numbers side-by-side, it is apparent that, for non-White students other than Hispanics, representation within the performance frameworks depends upon their results being grouped together with the results for Hispanic students.
- When results for non-White students are grouped under the “Minority Students” category, nearly 90% of elementary schools see all of those results included in the performance frameworks.
- If the results for non-White students were separated out into distinct race/ethnicity categories, roughly half of elementary schools would see results for groups other than Hispanics excluded from the performance frameworks.

2017 CMAS English Language Arts Achievement, Elementary Results:

Representation of non-White students using Minority Students Subgroup vs. using Race/Ethnicity Categories and Aggregated non-White Students

Ethnicity	Schools with Results	Reporting Using Minority Students Subgroup		Reporting using Race/Ethnicity Categories and Aggregated Non-White Subgroup		Difference	
		#	%	#	%	#	%
American Indian or Alaska Native	567	541	95%	234	41%	-307	-54%
Asian	781	757	97%	406	52%	-351	-45%
Black	799	774	97%	430	54%	-344	-43%
Hawaiian/Pacific Islander	252	246	98%	128	51%	-118	-47%
Hispanic	1,058	948	90%	948	90%	0	0%
Two or More Races	964	895	93%	466	48%	-429	-45%
All Non-White Students*	1,070	948	89%	371	35%	-577	-54%

* Note: This record is intended to show the proportion of schools where results for all non-white students within a given school would be represented. It is not a simple sum of the preceding categories.

Analysis: Reduced Representation of non-White Students in School-Level Reporting

- The impact at the middle school level is similar to what was just shown for elementary schools.
- When results for non-White students are grouped under the “Minority Students” category, nearly 80% of middle schools see all of those results included in the performance frameworks.
- If the results for non-White students were separated out into distinct race/ethnicity categories, the proportion of middle schools that would see results for groups other than Hispanics included in the performance frameworks would range from 41% to 60%.

2017 CMAS English Language Arts Achievement, Middle School Results:
Representation of non-White students using Minority Students Subgroup vs. using Race/Ethnicity Categories and Aggregated non-White Students

Ethnicity	Schools with Results	Reporting Using Minority Students Subgroup		Reporting using Race/Ethnicity Categories and Aggregated Non-White Subgroup		Difference	
		#	%	#	%	#	%
American Indian or Alaska Native	324	303	94%	132	41%	-171	-53%
Asian	403	371	92%	242	60%	-129	-32%
Black	397	369	93%	227	57%	-142	-36%
Hawaiian/Pacific Islander	161	158	98%	86	53%	-72	-45%
Hispanic	552	445	81%	445	81%	0	0%
Two or More Races	470	405	86%	263	56%	-142	-30%
All Non-White Students*	568	445	78%	189	33%	-256	-45%

* Note: This record is intended to show the proportion of schools where results for all non-white students within a given school would be represented. It is not a simple sum of the preceding categories.

Analysis: Reduced Representation of non-White Students in School-Level Reporting

- The impact at the high school level is different insofar as the representation of non-White students would be lower than at the elementary and middle school levels regardless of the reporting method.
- When results for non-White students are grouped under the “Minority Students” category, 58% of high schools see those results included in the frameworks.
- If the results for non-White students were separated out into distinct race/ethnicity categories, the proportion of high schools that would see results for groups other than Hispanics included in the performance frameworks would range from 39% to 46%.

2017 CMAS English Language Arts Achievement, High School Results:
Representation of non-White students using Minority Students Subgroup vs. using Race/Ethnicity Categories and Aggregated non-White Students

Ethnicity	Schools with Results	Reporting Using Minority Students Subgroup		Reporting using Race/Ethnicity Categories and Aggregated Non-White Subgroup		Difference	
		#	%	#	%	#	%
American Indian or Alaska Native	152	122	80%	54	36%	-68	-45%
Asian	217	189	87%	97	45%	-92	-42%
Black	217	181	83%	99	46%	-82	-38%
Hawaiian/Pacific Islander	73	69	95%	32	44%	-37	-51%
Hispanic	404	243	60%	240	59%	-3	-1%
Two or More Races	258	198	77%	100	39%	-98	-38%
All Non-White Students*	419	243	58%	97	23%	-146	-35%

* Note: This record is intended to show the proportion of schools where results for all non-white students within a given school would be represented. It is not a simple sum of the preceding categories.

Lack of Consistent Meaning for the term “Aggregated non-White Students”

- In addition to concerns about how the proposed change will impact the representation of non-White students in the performance frameworks, the Accountability Unit is concerned about how audiences will make sense of the “Aggregated non-White Students” group.
- The composition of the group is contingent by definition, so that the category would have no fixed meaning outside of the context of a particular subsection of a report for a specific school or district.
 - Because the composition of the group is driven by minimum n-count requirements, the individual race/ethnicity groups included within it will change depending on the level of aggregation.
 - Because minimum n-count requirements are not the same for all performance indicators, the composition of the group will differ from one indicator to another.
 - Even slight changes in a district or school’s demographics from one year to the next can impact which race/ethnicity groups get included in the group each year, which may rule out the possibility of historical comparisons.

Analysis: Lack of Consistent Meaning for the term "Aggregated non-White Students"

- To get a sense of the difficulties that would occur in trying to contextualize and make meaning out of this new category, consider the differences that would exist in the the composition of the "Aggregated non-White Students" group under the Achievement indicator versus the composition that would exist under the Growth indicator.
 - Because the set of growth results is smaller, and because the n-count required to report growth results is higher, fewer schools would have results reported for individual race/ethnic groups, and more results would be grouped together under the "Aggregated non-White Student" label.
 - The table below illustrates how these differences would play out across the state in the School Performance Frameworks.

2017 English Language Arts Achievement, School-Level Results:

Composition of "Aggregated non-White Students" Subgroup - Achievement vs. Growth

Ethnicity	Achievement Total non-White Students	Achievement # Included in Aggregated Non-White Subgroup	Achievement % Included in Aggregated Non-White Subgroup	Growth Total non-White Students	Growth # Included in Aggregated Non-White Subgroup	Growth % Included in Aggregated Non-White Subgroup
American Indian or Alaska Native	3,302	2,729	83%	2,467	2,108	85%
Asian	14,698	6,112	42%	12,169	6,686	55%
Black	20,423	5,137	25%	16,252	5,296	33%
Hawaiian/Pacific Islander	1,075	1,075	100%	818	818	100%
Hispanic	158,183	4,571	3%	125,093	8,289	7%
Two or More Races	18,123	8,869	49%	13,668	9,523	70%
Total	215,804	28,493	13%	170,467	32,720	19%

Analysis: Lack of Consistent Meaning for the term "Aggregated non-White Students"

- For many schools, the Achievement results reported for individual race/ethnicity groups would have no corresponding data point in the Growth results.
- Moreover, the "Aggregated non-White Student" group reported under the Achievement indicator would not be directly comparable to the "Aggregated non-White Student" group appearing under the Growth indicator.
- This same type of mismatch would occur with results reported under the PWR indicator, and similar complications would arise in trying to make comparisons between grade levels, between schools and districts, or between the same school from one year to the next.

2017 English Language Arts Achievement, School-Level Results:

Composition of "Aggregated non-White Students" Subgroup - Achievement vs. Growth

Ethnicity	Achievement Total non-White Students	Achievement # Included in Aggregated Non-White Subgroup	Achievement % Included in Aggregated Non-White Subgroup	Growth Total non-White Students	Growth # Included in Aggregated Non-White Subgroup	Growth % Included in Aggregated Non-White Subgroup
American Indian or Alaska Native	3,302	2,729	83%	2,467	2,108	85%
Asian	14,698	6,112	42%	12,169	6,686	55%
Black	20,423	5,137	25%	16,252	5,296	33%
Hawaiian/Pacific Islander	1,075	1,075	100%	818	818	100%
Hispanic	158,183	4,571	3%	125,093	8,289	7%
Two or More Races	18,123	8,869	49%	13,668	9,523	70%
Total	215,804	28,493	13%	170,467	32,720	19%

Should the individual race/ethnicity categories and 'Aggregated non-White Group' be included on the state frameworks instead of Minority?

PA2

	Pros	Cons	ESSA
<p>Current:</p> <p>Disaggregated reporting for Minority group included for points in framework calculations</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Aligns with previous SPF/DPF calculations Allows for longitudinal analysis and reporting (frameworks, UIP, DISH, etc.) Detailed race/ethnicity subgroups reported elsewhere to help identify where performance gaps are occurring, but not included for accountability 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Using the Minority flag for Achievement results, 98.3% of non-White students with eligible achievement are included in performance framework calculations (3,753 students not reported) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not in alignment with ESSA accountability reporting system
<p>Proposal 1:</p> <p>Disaggregated reporting by individual Race/Ethnicity Category and Aggregated non-White Group</p> <p>(8 new groups) included for points in framework calculations</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Sends message about importance of individual race/ethnicity categories Includes "Aggregated non-White" category that combines all results for race/eth groups not meeting minimum N for individual reporting 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Majority of surveyed stakeholders (78% Yes) wanted to use a super sub-group for SPF/DPF 2.0 in 2015 TAP was in favor of using super sub-group for SPF/DPF 2.0 in 2015 Using the individual race/ethnicity categories and Aggregated non-White group for Achievement results, 94.0% of students with eligible achievement are included in performance framework calculations (12,997 students not reported, increased by 9,244 from current minority reporting) Aggregated non-White group will not have consistent meaning/composition across different levels of reporting (grade, EMH level, school, district, etc.) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Aligns with ESSA accountability system requirements ESSA Hub group strongly in favor of including individual disaggregated groups
<p>Proposal 2:</p> <p>Report disaggregated Race/Ethnicity info, but do not include for points in framework calculations</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Pros of both Current and Proposal 1 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Duplicative information as students are counted in both Minority and individual race/eth category (if meet min N) 	

Slide 22

PA2

I removed the unit proposal slide, but feel comfortable pointing out that the unit recommends proposal #2 while talking through these 3 options.

Piche, Ashley, 2/27/2018

TAP Vote

- Should the individual race/ethnicity categories and 'Aggregated non-White Group' be included on the state frameworks instead of Minority?
 1. **Current Practice**- Disaggregated reporting for Minority group included for points in framework calculations
 2. **Alternative Proposal #1**- Disaggregated reporting by individual Race/Ethnicity Category and Aggregated non-White Group included for points in framework calculations
 3. **Alternative Proposal #2**- Report disaggregated Race/Ethnicity info, but do not include for points in framework calculations

Accountability Unit Recommendation

- Given these concerns, the Accountability Unit proposes the following approach to reporting results for non-White students on the 2018 performance frameworks:
 - Continue to use the “Minority Students” subgroup to make ratings and points determinations
 - Display results for individual race/ethnicity groups in cases where there are sufficient results to meet minimum n-count requirements
- This would provide transparency for individual race/ethnicity category performance where possible, while ensuring that results for the majority of non-White students continue to be represented in school and district performance framework ratings.

Other Outstanding Decision Items for 2018 Performance Frameworks

Marie Huchton

Accountability & Data Analysis



Should the new ESSA 4-year cap for including FEP students in the EL disaggregation be implemented for the performance frameworks?

Current Scenario: ELL subgroup includes NEP, LEP, FEP and FELL.

Pros

- Consistent with previous SPF/DPF reporting
- Includes more FEP students many years out of program, so could result in higher achievement outcomes

Cons

- Does not align with revised October count collection (which now includes FEP-Monitor 1, FEP-Monitor 2, FEP-Exit 1, FEP-Exit 2 and FELL as separate reporting categories)

Note: Does not align with ESSA

Proposal: ELL subgroup includes NEP, LEP, FEP (Monitor 1&2, Exit 1&2). FELL students are excluded.

Pros

- Aligns with revised October count collection

Cons

- Does not align with previous SPF/DPF reporting
- May result in slightly lower achievement outcomes

Impact

- The new coding methodology implemented for 2017-18 October count indicates around 13,611 students previously identified as FEP would now be considered FELL and excluded from accountability calculations (grades 3-11)

Comparison of Alternatives

	Pros	Cons	ESSA	Factors
Current: ELL subgroup includes NEP, LEP, FEP and FELL.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Consistent with previous SPF/DPF reporting - Includes more FEP students many years out of program, so could result in higher achievement outcomes 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Does not align with revised October count collection 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Does not align with ESSA 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 2017-18 October count data indicates around 13,611 students previously identified as FEP would now be considered FELL and excluded from state accountability calculations (grades 3-11)
Proposal 1: ELL subgroup includes NEP, LEP, FEP. FELL students are excluded.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Aligns with revised October count collection 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Does not align with previous SPF/DPF reporting - May result in slightly lower achievement outcomes 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Aligns with ESSA 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 2017-18 October count data indicates around 13,611 students previously identified as FEP would now be considered FELL and excluded from state accountability calculations (grades 3-11)

TAP Vote

- Should the new ESSA 4-year cap for including FEP students in the EL disaggregation be implemented for the performance frameworks?
 1. **Current Practice-** ELL subgroup includes NEP, LEP, FEP and FELL.
 2. **Alternative Proposal-** ELL subgroup includes NEP, LEP, FEP (Monitor 1&2, Exit 1&2). FELL students are excluded.